

6.1. Terms of reference

Terms of reference for the selection of an international consultant for the final evaluation of the project “ Strengthened Environmental Management Information System for Coastal Development to meet Rio Convention Objectives”

A. PROJECT CIV10-00088559 - STRENGTHENED ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR COASTAL DEVELOPMENT TO MEET RIO CONVENTION OBJECTIVES.

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP / GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures, all medium and large-scale projects supported by UNDP and Funded by GEF must be subjected to a final evaluation at the end of their implementation. These Terms of Reference (TORs) set out the expectations for a final evaluation of the project "Strengthening the Environmental Information Management System for the Development of Coastal Zone of Ivory Coast in response to the objectives of the Rio Conventions".

The essential project aspects to be evaluated are the following: (see table below).

PROJECT SUMMARY		Strengthening the Environmental Information Management System		
Project Title				
GEF Project ID:	5101		<i>upon approval (in USD)</i>	<i>upon completion (in USD)</i>
UNDP project ID:	4491	GEF funding:	550,000	550,000
Country :	Ivory Coast	Funding the implementation agency / execution agency	400,000	400,000
Region	Africa	Government	300,000	300,000
Focal area	Multi Focal Area		Others	
Objectives FA (OP/SP)	CCCD-2 : Generate, have access to and use information and knowledge	Total co-funding	700,000	700,000
Implementation agency	UNDP	project total cost	1,250,000	1,250,000
Other partners involved in the project:	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	DP's Signature (Starting date of Project):		17 March 2014
Closing date (operational):	Proposed date: 28 February 2016		Effective date :	28 February 2016

B. OBJECTIVE AND SIGNIFICANCE

Summary

In 2004, Ivory Coast as a signatory to the Rio conventions committed itself to undertake a self-evaluation of capacities to reinforce the management of the global environment launched in January 2000 by the Global Environment Fund (GEF) in collaboration with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The purpose of the initiative was to assist developing countries in identifying their priority needs and problems in the areas of biological diversity, climate change and land degradation in the overall context of sustainable development.

This self-evaluation exercise revealed eleven (11) intersectorial constraints including "low level of sensitization and poor knowledge for better decision-making". According to the NCSA (National Capacity Self-Assessment) report, environmental data and information intended to guide decision-making in order to meet global environmental objectives are scattered, often outdated, partial and inaccessible to users. The insufficient synergy within the activities, lack of efficiency and transparency in administrative institutions, including low level of knowledge of the transversal and holistic nature of the environmental themes by decision-makers were also highlighted.

An in-depth analysis of environmental problems and constraints in capacity building revealed that the coastal zone, one of the most important economic zones, did not experience optimal management of its environment. This was due to the lack of data and overlapping mandates of technical agencies and insufficient capacities of decentralized authorities to use environmental data for decision-making. There is therefore a need to develop environmental database and to establish a national environmental information management system that will provide decision-makers with an opportunity to respond more effectively to the obligations of the Rio conventions.

To overcome this constraint and with the support of UNDP, Ivory Coast has prepared and submitted to the GEF Secretariat the project "Strengthening the Environmental Information Management System for the Development of Coastal Zone of Ivory Coast in response to the objectives of the Rio conventions".

The project aims at strengthening the capacity of national and local decision-makers to use a national environmental information management system as a means of achieving global environmental objectives. It responds to the objectives of the GEF's three focal areas (biodiversity, climate change and sustainable land management). The project is specifically in line with the strategic priority related to intersectorial capacities.

Two strategic components characterize this project. These are:

1. Strengthening of the existing Environmental Information Management System (EMIS) and related structures and networks needed to improve overall environmental decision-making in the coastal zone;

- Presenting the current situation of data and information at both national and local levels;
- Establishing a Memorandum of Understanding with regard to the sharing of environmental data and information;
- Strengthening the existing database of coastal zone management;
- Strengthening organizational capacities of key management structures;
- Setting up an environmental information system.

2. The establishment of pilot sites to test EMIS at the local level in order to determine best replication conditions in all coastal areas of Ivory Coast.

- Institutional analysis of local governance structures;
- Conducting institutional management reforms in the local structures;
- Carrying out sensitization and training campaigns for stakeholders in the pilot municipalities;
- Creating a system of vertical information sharing and dissemination for integrated management of the coastal zone.

The expected results are:

- Current situation analysis of national and local data and information and related needs;
- Memoranda of Understanding on environmental data and information sharing were drafted and signed with national entities;
- Existing database of the management of the coastal zone was strengthened;
- Organizational capacities of key management structures were strengthened;
- Environmental information system for free access via the internet was set up.
- Institutional analysis of local government structures was carried out;
- Institutional information management reforms of local structures were carried out;
- Sensitization and training campaigns for stakeholders in the pilot municipalities were carried out;
- A system for the vertical information sharing and dissemination on integrated management of the coastal zone was available.

The final evaluation was carried out in accordance with the guidelines, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as outlined in the UNDP evaluation guidelines for GEF-funded projects.

The evaluation objectives were to assess the outcomes of the project and to draw lessons that would help improve the sustainability of the project benefits and promote the overall improvement of UNDP programs.

C. APPROACH AND METHOD OF EVALUATION

A comprehensive approach and methodology for conducting final evaluations of UNDP-supported and GEF-funded projects have been developed over time. The evaluator is expected to take into consideration the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as defined and explained in the UNDP guidelines for conducting final evaluations of projects supported by UNDP and funded by GEF. A series of questions covering each of these criteria have been written and included in the Terms of Reference (complete Appendix C). The evaluator must modify, complete and submit this table as part of an initial evaluation report and attach it to the final report in the appendix.

The evaluation must provide factual information which is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator must adopt a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close collaboration with government counterparts, in particular with the GEF operational focal person, UNDP country office, project team, UNDP- GEF based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator must carry out a field visit to Abidjan in Ivory Coast, and to the following municipalities: San Pedro, Grand Lahou, Port Bouët and Grand Bassam. Interviews will be held with at least the following organizations and individuals: Project focal persons within the Oceanological Research Center (ORC), Ecological Research Center (ERC), University Center for Research and Applications in Remote Sensing (UCRAT), Laboratory of Atmospheric Physics and Mechanics of Fluids (LAPA-MF), Research Center for Environment and Sustainable Development of Nagui Abrogoua University, the NGO SOS-FORESTS, Environment and Sustainable Development Federation (ESDF), GEOSERVICES, Anti-Pollution Center of Ivory Coast (APCIC), National Agency for Environment (NAE), Autonomous Port of Abidjan (APA), Autonomous Port of San Pedro (APSP), National Commission for Sustainable Development (NCSD), Department of Environmental Quality and Risk Prevention (DEQRP), Direction of Information and Documentation (DID) , Airport, Aeronautic, and Weather Forecasting Development Society (AAWFDS), Center for Mapping and Remote Sensing (CCRS), National Technical Studies and Development Office (NTSDO), Institute of Tropical Geography (ITG), Earth Spatial Surveillance (ESS) of the Permanent Secretariat of REDD +.

The evaluator will consult all relevant sources of information, such as project document, project reports, including the project annual report / report on project implementation and other reports, project budget review, mid-term review, progress reports, GEF focal area monitoring tools, project files, national policy and legal documents, and all other documents that the evaluator considers useful for this fact-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is attached to these Terms of Reference as Appendix B.

D. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS

An evaluation of the project performance, based on the expectations set out in the project logical framework / results framework (see appendix A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation and the corresponding verification means will be carried out. The evaluation will address at least the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Ratings must be provided against the following performance criteria. The

completed table must be attached to the evaluation summary. Mandatory rating scales are included in Appendix D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
<i>1-Monitoring and evaluation</i>	<i>Scoring</i>	<i>2-Execution agency / implementation agency</i>	<i>scoring</i>
Design of monitoring and evaluation upon entry		Quality of implementation by UNDP	
Implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan		Quality of execution: implementation agency	
Overall quality of monitoring and evaluation		Overall Quality of implementation and execution	
<i>3-Evaluation of results</i>	<i>Execution agency / implementation agency</i>	<i>4. Sustainability</i>	<i>Execution agency / implementation agency</i>
Relevance		Financial resources	
Effectiveness		Socio-political aspects:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall rating of project implementation		Environnemental aspects	
Overall probability of sustainability:			

E. PROJECT FUNDING/ CO-FUNDING

The evaluation will cover the main financial aspects of the project; in particular the part of the co-funding planned and executed. Data on costs and project funding will be required, including annual expenditures. Differences between planned and actual spending should be assessed and explained. The results of the recent financial audits available should be taken into account. The evaluators will benefit from the intervention of the Country Office (CO) and the project team in their quest for financial data to complete the co-funding table below, which will be included in the final evaluation report.

Co-funding (Type / source)	UNDP proper funding (USD million)		Government ((USD million)		Partner organization ((USD million)		Total ((USD million)	
	Planned	Real	Planned	Real	Planned	Real	Real	Real
Subsidie								
Loans / leases								
In-kind support								
Others								
Total								

F. INTEGRATION

UNDP-supported and -funded projects are key elements of the UNDP country program as well as regional and global programs. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has been successfully integrated into UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, natural disaster reduction and post-disaster recovery as well as gender issues.

G. IMPACT

Evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is reaching or progressing towards achieving the impacts. Among the main outcomes of the evaluations are the following: a) verifiable progress in ecological system, b) verifiable reduction of stress in ecological systems, or c) significant progress towards impact reduction

H. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt.

I. IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES

The main responsibility for the management of this evaluation falls under the re UNDP Country Office in Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire). The UNDP Country Office will contact the evaluators to ensure the timely payment of the per diem to the evaluation team and to finalize the country's travel arrangements. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the team of evaluators to organize stakeholder interviews and field visits, as well as coordination with the government, etc.

J. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

The evaluation will take a total of 20 working days according to the following plan:

Activity	duration	Completion date
Preparation	3 days	On 01, 02 and 03 February 2017
Evaluation Mission	10 days	On 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 February 2017
Draft evaluation report in French	6 days	On 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 et 27 February 2017
Final report in English	1 day	on 28 February 2017

K. PRODUCTS TO BE DELIVERED UNDER THE TERMS OF THE EVALUATION

The following elements are expected from the evaluation team:

Deliverables	Contents	Duration	responsibilities
Initial report	The evaluator shall provide details on the timetable and methodology	No later than two weeks before the evaluation mission.	The evaluator sends the report to the UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial conclusions	End of the evaluation mission	At the UNDP CO project head quarter Sent to the CO,
Draft final report (in French)	Full Report, (as attached) with Appendices (in French)	Within three weeks of the evaluation mission	Reviewed by RTA, the Program Coordination Unit and PFOs of GEF
Final report*(in English)	Revised report in English	Within one week after receipt of UNDP comments on the project	Sent to CO for uploading on the UNDP CGELE website.

* During the presentation of the final evaluation report, the evaluator is also required to provide a room for audit, explaining in detail how comments received (or have not) have been addressed in the report.

L. THE TEAM MEMBERS

The evaluation team will be composed of an international evaluator. The consultant must have proof of previous experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience in GEF-funded projects is an advantage. The selected evaluator must not have participated in the preparation or implementation of the project and must not have a conflict of interest with the project activities.

The evaluator must have the following qualifications:

- A higher education degree, 3rd cycle education(BAC + at least5 years)
- Qualification in one of the following domains: economics, statistics, environment or related field, and being a specialist in planning,;
- At least 5 years of relevant professional experience;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
- previous experience with result-oriented monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Having technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas;
- Knowledge of environmental information system;
- Excellent command of French and English (writing, speaking and reading).

M. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE EVALUATOR

The evaluation consultant is required to adhere to the highest ethical standards and must sign a code of conduct (see Appendix E) for acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles set out in the "UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations"

N. MODES OF PAYMENT AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Step
20 %	Following the presentation of the validated work plan
50 %	Following the presentation and approval of the first draft of the final evaluation report in French
30 %	Following the submission and approval (by the BP project of UNDP and RTA) of the final evaluation report in English

O. NOMINATION PROCESS

The Consultant's financial offer must be at a fixed-price contract. The package must include payment fees, and mission expenses, etc.

Offer submission

The following documents must be included:

- a) Curriculum Vitae (CV) or P11, indicating all previous experiences and contacts (email and phone number) of 3 references.
- b) A brief description of the working methodology and the approach to perform the work according to the TORs
- c) The financial proposal indicating the fixed amount proposed by the tenderer for the mission to be conducted.

Technical evaluation criteria

	Recap of evaluation forms of technical proposal	Maximum rating	Consultant				
			A	B	C	D	E
1	Qualification and experience in the field	40					
2	Work plan	10					
3	Proposed methodology and approach to perform the work according to TOR	50					
	Total	100					

Technical proposal evaluation form- form 1		Maximum number of points	Consultant				
			A	B	C	D	E
Proposed methodology and approach to perform work according to TOR							
1.1	Degrees	10					
1.2	Relevant experience in final evaluation	10					
1.3	Expertise in the field of evaluation of GEF-UNDP projects relating to the environment	15					
1.4	Previous references for similar work	5					
		40					

Technical proposal evaluation form-form 2		Maximum number of points	Consultant				
			A	B	C	D	E
Work plan							
2.1	Is the work plan well defined, well detailed, and in line with the terms of references	10					
		10					

Technical proposal evaluation form-form 3		Maximum number of points	Consultant				
			A	B	C	D	E
Proposed methodology and approach to perform work according to TOR							
3.1	Does the proposal show a general understanding of the project?	10					
3.2	Have the important aspects of the task been dealt with in sufficient details?	10					
3.3	Does the proposal include a coherent methodological framework?	15					
3.4	Does the proposal include a relevant monitoring and evaluation framework?	5					
3.5	Is the presentation clear and are the succession of activities and planning logical, realistic, and sufficient enough for a successful implementation of the project?	10					
		50					

APPENDIX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:</p> <p>National and local capacities are reinforced for the implementation and the monitoring of environmental policies and project/programmes</p>
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</p> <p>Policies document and strategies are updated Environmental database developed and regularly updated.</p>
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</p> <p>Mainstreaming environment and energy OR</p> <p>Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</p> <p>CCCD-2: Generate, access and use of information and knowledge</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</p> <p>Improved knowledge management systems yield better policy and programme decisions for the global environment, by:</p> <p>2.1 Institutions and stakeholders have skills and knowledge to research, acquire and apply information collective actions;</p> <p>2.2 Increased capacity of stakeholders to diagnose, understand and transform complex dynamic nature of global environmental problems and develop local solutions ;</p> <p>2.3 Public awareness raised and information management improved</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</p> <p>Increased number of socio-economic policies, plans, and programmes call for explicit deliverables of global environmental benefits. In particular:</p> <p>Institutions and stakeholders trained how to use different tools available to manage information; Stakeholders are better informed via workshops and trainings about global challenges and local actions required; Ability of stakeholders to diagnose, understand and transform information and knowledge into local actions increased and retained in 16 countries; Knowledge platform established to share lessons</p>

learned among CBOs and CSOs across SGP participating countries (Number); Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities (Number)					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets 2016	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Project objective3 (equivalent to output in atlas)</p> <p>To strengthen the capacity of national and local decision-makers to use a national environmental management information system as a means to apply lessons learned and best practices to meet global environmental objectives within the setting of coastal development</p>	<p>Impact Indicators:</p> <p>Ability of stakeholders to diagnose, understand and transform information about environmental management into local actions increased and retained;</p> <p>*% of overall government budget for environmental protection and rehabilitation activities within national budgets;</p>	<p>Capacity of the main stakeholders is low and dispersed over many organisations;</p> <p>* Budgets for environmental initiatives in CI remain low (less than 1% of total government budget spending) due to ignorance of environmental impacts of human interventions;</p>	<p>50% of stakeholders have benefitted from capacity building activity for better use of the EMIS for monitoring progress in coastal zone management (e.g. training and workshops);</p> <p>* EMIS has contributed to a significant rise in the elaboration of environmental projects (7%), particularly in the coastal zone.</p>	<p>capacity development monitoring scorecards;</p> <p>FNDE year reports;</p> <p>Subscription of environmental projects in Public Investments Portfolio;</p> <p>INS Statistics</p> <p>Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation Report</p>	<p>Less/no extreme climate events occur that can accelerate sea level rise by triggering floods and debris flow in the targeted locations.</p> <p>Political stability and security situation is favourable to implement planned activities.</p> <p>Economic growth in CI continues to rise after the 2011 crisis;</p> <p>the various government agencies respect their commitment to transfer funds to FNDE;</p> <p>private sector enterprises and project proponents understand the necessity to comply with the obligations for EIA and SIA;</p> <p>* government stands by its intentions and priorities as noted in the PNAE, NCSA</p> <p>strategy and action plan and the recently adopted Environmental policy and action plan.</p>

learned among CBOs and CSOs across SGP participating countries (Number); Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities (Number)					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets 2016	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Outcome 14</p> <p>Strengthened environmental management information system and associated structures and networks established for improved global environmental decision-making related to all coastal areas in Cote d'Ivoire.</p> <p>To the extent possible: data will be standardized; scientifically sound methods will be better applied; data and information gaps filled; open access to data and information;</p> <p>Translation of data and information significantly increases their accessibility to decision-makers; and the financial</p>	<p>number of studies and projects that have made use of EMIS for baseline information;</p> <p>Percentage of stakeholders that indicate to be better informed about environmental issues within their area of intervention;</p> <p>knowledge platform established between key stakeholders at various levels to exchange data on environmental issues;</p>	<p>Since a coordinated EMIS doesn't exist yet, the number of projects that use it as basis is zero.</p> <p>Most government agencies retain control over their data bases and sources of information; sharing on ad hoc basis and on demand.</p> <p>The CNDD is the only high level exchange platform on environmental issues, but there is no specific focus on coastal zone.</p>	<p>At the End of Project (2016), 75% of all new projects and studies with an environmental component make use of the EMIS at ANDE;</p> <p>40% of stakeholders indicate to have been proactively engaged in information exchanges on coastal zone management.</p> <p>75% of Stakeholders acknowledge the Regional Committee for Sustainable Development (CRDD) within the coastal zone as the main platform for stakeholder information</p> <p>exchange and monitoring of sustainable development in the coastal zone;</p>	<p>list of projects that have benefited from an ANDE evaluation for EIA/SEA;</p> <p>CRDD and CNDD monitoring reports; State of the CI Environment 2016;</p> <p>Project records, supplemented by beneficiary verification;</p> <p>CNTIG and ANDE year reports</p> <p>Project monitoring reports;</p> <p>hit-counter on ANDE website;</p>	<p>There will be no/limited transfers of trained technical staff in other ministries/departments or in other non-government organisations.</p> <p>National environmental registries and their data continue to be maintained and updated adequately</p> <p>Political will of government agencies to freely share public data and information</p> <p>CNDD and CRDD's are rendered operational;</p> <p>the data sharing infrastructure established in CI can handle exchange of large quantities of data produced by SIG;</p>

learned among CBOs and CSOs across SGP participating countries (Number); Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities (Number)					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets 2016	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	sustainability of the EMIS is secured.				
<p>Outcome 2</p> <p>Improved coastal zone management decision-making based on better information systems tested in key area.</p>	<p>Public awareness about specific challenges and actions in the coastal zone environment;</p> <p>% of local development plans produced on basis of ANDE environmental profiles;</p> <p>number of submissions of local environmental</p>	<p>communities are not aware of the severity of the environmental problems in their locality;</p> <p>only 4 environmental profiles of communities have been produced and none of these have lead to changes in Local Development Plans</p>	<p>75% of local leaders are aware of environmental issues in their community and allot proper priority to sound NRM;</p> <p>all coastal zone communities have participated in the Strategic Impact</p>	<p>Survey, Gender disaggregated interviews, field monitoring and testing during the yearly recurring 15-days environment campaign;</p>	<p>Institutions established at the community and district level are functional and supportive to implement the project activities.</p> <p>Communities participate in project awareness generation and training activities on Integrated Coastal Zone Management, learn how to operate and maintain the EMIS</p>

learned among CBOs and CSOs across SGP participating countries (Number); Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities (Number)					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets 2016	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	activities resulting from LPD		Assessment by ANDE for the elaboration of their LPDs and are knowledgeable about the environmental activities in their community;	Interviews with Prefectures and Regional reports; LDPs	and see value in maintaining it beyond the life of the project. Local communities perceive value and support in improved coastal zone management above and being taking care of waste management;

Appendix B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE EXAMINED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. The UNDP-GEF Project Document "Strengthening the Environmental Information Management System" signed by both the Government and UNDP;
2. The Report of the Local Committee for the Project Evaluation (CLEP);
3. The Initial Project Report;
4. Quarterly Reports;
5. Annual reports;
6. Annual Work Plans (PTAs);
7. Revised Annual Work Plans;
8. Monitoring and Evaluations plans;
9. The audit report of 2015;
10. Reports of the Steering Committee;
11. Combined delivery reports by Activity (CDR);
12. The Ivorian Government - UNDP Cooperation Program Document for the period 2009-2015;
13. The "UNDAF 2013-2016;
14. The NDP 2012-2015;
15. The Strategic Objectives of GEF-5;
16. The project website (<http://sgie.ci/>);
17. Presentation of the four pilot sites of the project and contacts of the focal points;
18. The Project Geoportal;
19. The project press clippings.

